MIGRATION TO A FIVE COUNTY SOUTHERN OHIO AREA: A WORKING PAPER

by

Donald W. Thomas

Dept. of Agricultural Economics
and Rural Sociology
Ohio Agricultural Research and
Development Center

March 1978

ESO Number 461

MIGRATION TO A FIVE COUNTY SOUTHERN OHIO AREA: A WORKING PAPER

by Donald W. Thomas

Introduction

A new trend in rural-urban migration has been evident in various parts of the United States since about 1970. U.S. Census Bureau estimates, first analyzed by Beale (1975), showed nonmetropolitan counties growing faster than metropolitan counties. This represented a reversal from the trends of previous decades.

The initial reaction to this analysis was that this was probably "...just an increased rate of sprawl out of metropolitan areas into adjacent nonmetropolitan territories." (Beale, 1976:954) There was evidence that several metropolian areas had been experiencing considerable decentralization of population beyond the suburbs and into the rural-urban fringe. Countering this explanation, however, was the observation of growth in previous no-growth areas such as the Ozarks, Northern New England, the Upper Great Lakes, portions of the Appalachian and Blue Ridge Mountain regions and areas in the Rocky Mountain West. (Beale 1976:956)

Table 1

Population Change and Net Migration by Metropolitan Status, United States, 1970-75

	Percentage Change		Net Migration	
	1970-75	1960-70	1970-75	1960-70
Total U.S.	4.8	13.4	1.2	1.7
Metropolitan Counties	4.1	17.0	.4	4.7
Nonmetropolitan Counties	6.6	4.4	3.4	-5.7
Adjacent Counties	7.3	7.3	4.1	-2.7
Nonadjacent Counties	5.9	1.4	2.7	-8.7
Entirely Rural Counties	7.0	-4.2	4.9	-12.2

Source: Beale 1977

Further analysis of available data by Beale refuted the "decentralization" explanation as the sole reason for the increased nonmetropolitan growth. Table 1 shows nonmetropolitan counties with a higher growth rate and a substantial edge in net migration during the 1970's, which is a reversal from the 1960's. The further breakdown of nonmetropolitan counties into those adjacent to metropolitan areas versus those farther removed illustrates the expanded nature of the current rural growth. While the adjacent counties have grown as much in the first five years of the 1970's as they did in the total decade of the sixties, the nonadjacent counties, in relative terms, have experienced a much greater change. Further, separating out the entirely rural counties (those with no village or town of 2,500 population or more) provides more evidence of the current rural turnaround. These rural counties, which lost population at the rate of 4.2 percent in the 1960's, have grown by 7.0 percent so far in this decade. The net migration figures solidify this trend.

One bit of additional evidence was provided by Beale (1977) when he cross-classified nonmetropolitan counties by growth rates and population density. The greatest percentage increase was found in counties with the least density (under 10 people per square mile). These same counties lost population in the 1960's.

Recent Trends in Ohio

Analysis of data for Ohio, comparable to Beale's national data, shows similar trends. Table 2 shows Ohio's nonmetropolitan counties growing much more rapidly than metropolitan counties and having turned from outmigration in the 1960's to inmigration in the 1970's. The states entirely rural counties show this same trend in an even more extreme manner.[1/]

[1/] For a more complete analysis of population change and net migration of Ohio counties by size and location, see Thomas (1977).

Table 2

Population Change and Net Migration by Metropolitan Status, Ohio, 1970-1975

	Percent Population Change		Percent Net Migration	
	1970-75	1960-70	1970-75	1960-70
State Total	1.0	9.8	-2.6	-1.3
Metropolitan Counties	0.1	11.0	-3.5	-0.6
Nonmetropolitan Counties	4.4	5.1	0.8	-4.2
Entirely Rural	12.2	-5.2	10.0	-10.2

Source: Thomas 1977

Specifically, 15 Ohio counties have evidenced a population turnaround in the 1970's. All of these counties are located in southern and eastern Ohio in what is commonly referred to as the Appalachian region of the state (Thomas, 1976). Five of these counties had previously been designated by the College of Agriculture at Ohio State University as an area of extensive research and extension programs under Title V of the Rural Development Act of 1972. This program was given the title, "Generating Rural Ohio Wealth", with the acronym GROW. The GROW area consists of Athens, Gallia, Meigs, Jackson and Vinton counties. The present study of population change in the GROW area was undertaken as a part of the above program.

Related Literature

The rural turnaround phenomenon is of recent enough origin that little in the way of research into the who and why of it has been completed.

One might be tempted to look to a number of residential preference studies for a possible explanation. These surveys, going back to the 1940's, have consistently shown that a majority of people prefer to live in small town or rural areas*. However, in recent years, the early findings have been attenuated by

*For a comparison of these early studies, see Fuguitt and Zuiches (1975).

research which has placed conditions on questions involving residential preferences. Fuguitt and Zuiches (1975) reported that about 75 percent of their national sample preferred living in places of less than 50,000 population. However, this preference drops to nineteen percent when the condition is added that these residences would be more than 30 miles from a large city. The others preferred living closer to a place of at least 50,000 population. Likewise, Carpenter (1977) found 52 percent of his Arizona sample preferring places under 50,000, but this percentage declined when a distance condition was added. In addition, Carpenter imposed a condition of 10 percent loss of income for living outside a larger city, which further reduced the percentage of those desiring to live there.

Thus, it would appear that the residential preference notion is not as important as was earlier expected. However, the matter of relative size of the populations involved must be kept in mind. It only takes a small percentage of those living in urban areas, if they were to move, to bring about a turnaround in the lesser populated rural areas. For example, Vinton County, which is in the current study area, has a population of approximately 10,000. An inmigration of 600 people would give Vinton County a six percent migration rate. That same number of people would make up a very small percentage of a metropolitan area.

Wardwell (1977) suggests that other factors may be involved in the recent population shifts. One possibility is that past rural to urban migration has created a disequilibrium so that population concentration in urban areas is nearing its limit. The rural turnaround would be a reaction to this concentration towards restoring equilibrium.

In sum, very little is known about current population trends. The present study is intended to be explanatory in nature and as such will provide information which more in depth research can build on.

Objectives of the Study

The present study has four major objectives.

1. To determine the socio-economic characteristics of the recent migrants to the GROW area.

   Characteristics of the migrants, such as age, marital status, occupation, education and income will go far in assessing possible implications of recent growth for the local communities involved.

2. To determine the origin of migrants to the GROW area.

   Determination of whether the new residents came from rural or urban, farm or nonfarm, metropolitan or nonmetropolitan areas will help in understanding the nature of the current migration trends. It will also give clues to the extent of similarities or differences which might exist between natives and newcomers.

3. To determine the reasons why the migrants are moving to the GROW area.

   Understanding the motivations which prompted the migrants to leave their original area and settle in the study area is essential to understanding recent population trends and in determining if the trends will be of long or short term duration.

4. To assess the implications of migration for the area and local communities.

   Such important areas as housing, schools, and governmental services could be affected by substantial growth. In addition, the arrival of newcomers could signal approaching conflict if the new residents hold significantly different values and attitudes from the native population.

All four objectives are discussed in this report. However, objective 4 above will be amplified in a later paper. The present paper reports on a survey of migrants. An additional survey was made of community leaders with attention to

their assessment of the implications of recent growth. A report on that survey will be made at a later date.

The Study Area

The five county area which serves as the locale of the current study is located in the unglaciated area of southern Ohio. The area is primarily rural, with the city of Athens being the only place over 10,000 in population. With the exception of Athens County, the area generally experienced either slow growth or population decline between 1940 and 1970. Table 2a shows that all five counties experienced outmigration in the 1950's and all but Athens County lost population through outmigration in the 1960's.

Table 2a

Net Migration Rate, Five Counties,
1950-60, 1960-70, and 1970-75

County	Percent Net Migration		
	1970-75	1960-70	1950-60
Athens	-10.1	10.5	-6.3
Gallia	9.0	-8.5	-5.4
Jackson	3.8	-12.8	-6.6
Meigs	6.5	-13.2	-11.6
Vinton	6.2	-14.3	-15.4

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census (1976), USDA (1975) and USDA (1965).

In the turnaround period of 1970 to 1975, all counties but Athens have experienced net inmigration.

A note is in order regarding Athens County. This county is a special case, due to its being the location of Ohio University. The county totals strongly reflect changes in enrollment at the University. During the 1960's, Ohio University was rapidly gaining enrollment, giving Athens County a high inmigration rate.

The early 1970's was a period of declining enrollment and outmigration. It was originally thought that Athens County should be excluded from the study. However, it was felt that the decline in Athens city might be masking a rural turnaround in the rest of the county. Subsequent population estimates from the Census Bureau showed this to be the case and Athens was included in the survey.

Table 2b presents a series of profile statistics for the five counties. State averages are also included for comparison.

Table 2b

Profile Statistics for GROW Counties, 1970

	County					
	Athens	Gallia	Jackson	Meigs	Vinton	Ohio
Percent Urban	51.2	29.7	45.1	27.6	0	75.3
Median Age	23.0	30.4	30.6	31.9	29.2	27.7
Percent Under 18 Years	25.2	32.0	35.1	34.0	35.9	35.1
Percent 65 Years	9.1	11.4	13.0	13.8	12.5	9.4
Median Education	12.2	10.0	10.5	10.5	10.1	12.1
Median Income	$7,628	$6,915	$6,635	$6,485	$6,334	$10,313
Percent Under Poverty Level	13.1	19.1	20.5	22.1	19.9	7.6
Percent Nonwhite	3.1	4.5	0.8	1.3	0.3	9.4
Percent Employed in Manufacturing	13.2	15.0	30.8	18.2	29.7	35.6
Percent Employed in White-Collar Occupations	49.0	37.3	36.7	34.9	28.7	45.4
Percent Unemployed	5.9	6.0	7.6	7.5	8.3	4.0

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Series PC(1)-B37 and PC(1)-C37

In 1970, all counties were considerably below the state average in urbanization, ranging from Vinton County with no urban places to Athens County at about fifty percent urban. The average age of the population in the five counties

was older than the state average, with the exception of Athens. Since the proportion of the population under 18 years was not far from the state average for most of the counties, it suggests that a substantial part of past outmigration has been from the young adult population, possibly migrating after high school graduation. The aged have probably not been leaving the area due to the relatively higher proportions over 65 years of age.

The average educational level was one-and-a-half to two years below the average, again with the exception of Athens County. Median income was well below the state average and up to three times the state norm were under the Census Bureau poverty level. The area is predominantly white.

Variation is found in employment in the five counties. Jackson and Vinton Counties were slightly under the average in manufacturing employment, with the other three counties well below. All but Athens had less white collar employment than average. All counties had a higher unemployment rate than the state, with Vinton County more than double the average.

Methodology

The major methodological problem to be addressed in this study was the obtaining of a sample of recent migrants to the study area. Several sources were considered, but rejected because of a lack of reliability or of the possibility of obtaining a biased sample. These included the use of official records such as utilities, property transfers, and school enrollments. A first attempt at building a list of migrants was to contact township trustees in one of the study counties. It was felt that these local officials might have knowledge of residential change in their area. Such was not the case, however. Only a small percentage of trustees were knowledgeable enough to be of assistance.

The second attempt was more fruitful. This involved contacting local postmasters and rural mail carriers. One of the largest post offices in the area was used as a test, and proved to be successful. Permission was received from the two Sectional Centers serving the area to contact local post offices and obtain the names and addresses of recent migrants. A letter from the Sectional Postmasters was sent to each local office asking their cooperation. Subsequently, either the investigator or his Graduate Assistant visited each of the 63 post offices in the five county area. At each location, the purpose of the study was explained and forms were left for each postmaster and rural mail carrier on which they could list new residents. Post offices not responding within two weeks were sent a reminder. Only two of the 63 post offices refused to cooperate.

The cooperators were asked to list all residents on their routes who had moved into the area in 1970 or later, and who they believed to be permanent residents. This procedure resulted in a list of approximately 3500 names from the study area.

It was necessary, due to limitations imposed by the three post offices, to limit the study to small towns, villages and rural open country. The incorporated area of the three largest cities in the area were excluded. This included the cities of Athens, Gallipolis and Jackson. Evidence from Current Population Reports (1976) indicates that this exclusion will have a minimum affect on the results of the research.

Table 3 shows that none of the three cities participated in the rural turnaround to any significant extent. In fact, both Athens and Gallipolis lost population between 1970 and 1975. Jackson grew by only 2.9 percent during the same period. In contrast, the rural areas of Athens, Jackson and Gallia counties all grew in the five year period.

Table 3

Comparison of County and City Population Change
for Athens, Jackson and Gallia Counties, 1970-1975

Area	Percent Population Change 1970-1975
Athens County	-7.5
Athens City	-18.3
Balance of County	+0.8
Jackson County	+7.2
Jackson City	+2.9
Balance of County	+8.9
Gallia County	+9.7
Gallipolis City	-5.2
Balance of County	+16.0

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census (1977)

The Sample

Every third name of the new residents list was selected for inclusion in the sample. This resulted in a total of 1,134 names, each of which received a mailed questionnaire, stamped return envelope and cover letter explaining the nature of the research. The questionnaire had previously been critiqued by colleagues and submitted to a pre-test by a sample from the migrants list.

The original list of names was in approximate proportion to the population size of each of the five counties in the study area. Thus, no attempt was made to weight the sample. In addition, it is the intent of the study to focus on the area as a five county region and not to specify county results unless the findings show unusual differentials.

Response

Three weeks after the original mailing, a follow-up postcard was sent to non-respondents. One month later, an attempt was made to phone a sample of nonrespon-

dents. Using a statewide telephone system, 234 phone calls were made. These calls, plus information on some of the previously returned questionnaires, revealed a condition that had not been expected, at least not in the magnitude that existed. This was the fact that many of those receiving questionnaires were not migrants in the sense used in the study. The guidelines used in this research considered people to be migrant if they had moved from anywhere outside the five county study area to anywhere within the five counties. Many of those on the new resident lists obtained from the post offices were people who had moved within the same county or within the five county region. Many of those contacted by telephone indicated that since the questions were aimed at movers from outside the area, they did not return the form.

Thus, a response rate may be calculated in several different ways. Of the original sample, 303 questionnaires were returned, a response of 26.7 percent. However, 81 of these were from movers within the region and not migrants from outside, resulting in 222 migrants giving a response rate of 19.6 percent.

Making additional assumptions, however, a more realistic rate of response may be obtained. Of the 234 telephone calls made, 135 or 57.7 percent were nonmigrants. If the assumption is made that this is representative of the entire residents list, then only 57.7 percent of those who received questionnaires were actually eligible for the study. Then only 488 of the original sample were migrants (57.7 percent of 1,134). The return of 222 questionnaires then represents a 45.5 percent return rate. Since the telephone calls were made at random in all five counties, the above assumption would appear to be reasonable.

In addition, some information was collected from the 99 migrants who were telephoned and had not returned questionnaires. A comparison of the telephone respondents with those returning questionnaires reveals a minimum of difference.

Findings

The results of the current study are presented according to the objective that they pertain to.

I. Characteristics of the Migrants

Sex and Marital Status:

Questionnaires were mailed to households and many of the questions refer to both husband and wife and the family. Thus, the sex variable needs to be viewed in combination with marital status.

Tables 4 and 5 show that over 85 percent of the respondents were male, but generally represented families, with 86 percent of the sample being married. Only 8 percent were single.

Age:

The median age of the migrants was 33.5 years, with nearly 44 percent in the 25 to 34 year category. About six percent were over 65 years, with nearly 17 percent over 55 years. Thus, the migrants are overwhelmingly grouped in the younger work force ages (Table 6).

Place of Birth:

Both state and county of birth were obtained from the migrants. About 3 out of every 5 were born in Ohio. Of those born in other states, nearly half were born in West Virginia. The second most frequent state was Kentucky, which accounted for about 11 percent (Table 7).

Table 8 shows that about 3 out of every 8 migrants born in Ohio were born within the study area. An additional 15 percent were born in counties adjacent to the study area. Thus, over half of the migrants' place of birth was in these two categories. For the remaining migrants, only two counties were in evidence with an appreciable percentage; Franklin County (15.6%) and Cuyahoga County (5.2%).

A different categorization is presented in Table 9, which reveals that the greatest percentage of migrants were born in the core county[2/] of an SMSA, followed in order by the study area counties.

Employment:

Two-thirds of the migrants are employed full-time (Table 10). The second most prevalent category consists of retired persons (13.1%). Only five percent reported being unemployed. Only 15 percent of the respondents hold second jobs (Table 11).

More of the spouses in the study were in the homemaker group than any of the other employment categories (46.2%). This compares with 28.4 percent employed full-time, with an additional 11.1 percent working part-time. Only 7.4 percent of the spouses considered themselves unemployed (Table 12).

Occupation:

As categorized in Table 13, the migrants to the study area are employed in a variety of occupation types. The major group is employed in skilled blue collar occupations (27.4%). Semi and unskilled workers make up almost 20 percent, followed by white collar and professional workers (17.2% and 16.7%, respectively).

Detailed occupations were also obtained from the respondents. In Table 14, the major specific occupational types are listed. The major professional occupations were educational and professional engineers and scientists. However, the category also includes doctors, dentists, lawyers and ministers.

[2/] Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas are made up of counties with a central city of at least 50,000 people. The county which contains the central city is called the core county. The metropolitan counties which surround a core county are called ring counties. These ring counties are considered to be economically tied to the core county, but do not contain central cities. For example, Franklin County is a core county of the Columbus SMSA, and Delaware, Madison, Pickaway and Fairfield counties are ring counties.

Managers and buyers and civil service employees make up the major white collar occupations which also includes clerical workers and health paraprofessionals.

The major blue collar skilled occupations are construction and maintenance workers and operators, which includes such occupations as machine and press operators. The semi- and unskilled occupations are general labor and construction and maintenance labor. General coal miners are also included in this category.

Farm Activity:

Very few respondents indicated farming as an occupation. However, specific questions were asked in the study regarding farm activity. From Table 15, one of six respondents indicated ownership of a farm. The size of the farms ranged from 13 acres to 220 acres. From Table 16, over one-third of the farms are between 50 and 100 acres, with 27 percent between 100 and 150 acres. The median size of farm is 80 acres.

When asked specifically about work on farms, less than ten percent of those indicating farm activity farm full-time. Almost two-thirds farm part-time, with an additional one-fourth working for wages (Table 17). Thus, over 18 percent of the migrants (41 of 222) indicate some farm activity.

Family Size:

Over 42 percent of the migrant families have no children living at home, with an additional 39 percent having only one or two children living with them (Table 18). This is somewhat surprising, in light of the fact that the predominant age groups of the respondents are 25 to 44 years.

In line with age of parents, the ages of the children are predominantly young. Over one-third are 5 to 9 years, with about one-fifth under 5 years and another one-fifth being 10 to 14 years of age (Table 19).

Education:

Over three-fourths of the migrants have a high school education or more (Table 20). Nearly 21 percent have completed college, and an additional 19 percent have some college experience.

Slightly under three-fourths of spouses have at least completed high school, with over 12 percent completing college (Table 21).

The median of 12 years of education is probably a half to one year above that of the native population, given the fact that the average in the area in 1970 was 10 to 10.5 years. Some increase would probably have taken place since 1970, due to deaths of the older natives.

Income:

The median family income of the migrants is slightly over $12,000, with 27 percent of the families earning between $10,000 and $15,000. Nearly 17 percent earn less than $5,000, and about the same proportion make over $20,000. Thus, the migrants represent a full range of family income (Table 22).

The median income in the region in 1970 was between $6,500 and $7,000. Adjusting for inflation would bring this up to $9,00 to $9,500 by 1975. Thus, the migrants appear to be averaging significantly higher incomes than the longer term residents.

II. Reasons for Moving

A second major question to be answered by this study is, "Why did the migrants move to southern Ohio?" Two questions were aimed specifically at this objective. The first was an open-ended one, asking respondents why they and their families had moved to the study area. The second question asked for the respondents to assess the importance of 14 factors in their decision to move.

Open-Ended Response:

Respondents were asked to specify why they had moved into the study area. Responses were coded into twenty specific categories, with a maximum of three responses per respondent. In fact, most respondents gave only one reason. About 37 percent gave two reasons for moving, and only eight percent gave three or more reasons.

Table 23 shows the major responses to reasons for moving. The most important single reason given was job opportunity, followed closely by the general response of "to live in the country". Because of the relatedness of several specific reasons, more insight into motivation can be gained from Table 24, where reasons have been collapsed into more general categories. The first category consists of reasons related either to the area of origin or the area of destination (37.2 percent). This includes the general responses of "to get out of the city" and "to live in the country". Responses specific to the area are also included, which contain reasons such as cost of living, the lack of pollution, a place to raise children, etc.

The second most prevalent category contains 23 percent of the responses which revolve around the idea of "coming back home". Included here are reasons such as marriage and to be near relatives.

Job related reasons, including job opportunities and job transfer, also account for about 23 percent of the reasons given. Retirement was the only other category to receive significant response, at 6.3 percent.

Response to Specific Reasons:

Respondents, after giving their open-ended responses, were asked to rate the importance of 14 factors in their decision to move. They could rate these factors as very important, important, not very important, or not important at all. Table 25 presents the responses of the migrants. The

factors of "to live in the country" and "to get out of the city" received the most "very important" responses, followed by "to raise children", freedom from pollution, and job transfer.

In an effort to simplify the results, the responses were arbitrarily given weights so that a single score could be computed for each factor. Very important was weighted as 3, important as 2, and not very important as 1. Not important at all was weighted as zero. Multiplying the number of responses in each category by the appropriate weight, and summing the resulting outcomes gives a total weighted score for each factor. These scores are shown in Table 26.

It is quite obvious that factors related to the area are most important. "To live in the country" and "to get out of the city" rank first and second by a wide margin. The next four factors are all specifics related to the area in question. These are freedom from pollution, a place to raise children, lower crime rates, and lower cost of living. Job transfers, job opportunities, recreational facilities and educational facilities all ranked very closely in total weights.

It may seem somewhat surprising that job related reasons do not rank any higher than they do. There are a number of possible reasons for this finding. One is that only about two-thirds of the migrants are employed full-time. Another is that while jobs are important, their importance in the decision-making process is overshadowed by the other factors.

Job Change:

Respondents were asked specifically about job changes associated with their move to southern Ohio. From Table 27, 62 percent of the migrants changed jobs when they moved. Table 28 shows that more of those responding got their job after the move (40.8%) than those who had the jobs before the

move or who already had a job (29.8 percent and 29.3 percent respectively).

Reasons for Moving by Area Moved From:

Further insight into the reasons for moving can be obtained by cross-classifying the reasons for moving by the type of area where the respondents had originated. This will answer the question as to whether those who moved from cities had different reasons for moving than those who moved from rural areas.

The procedure used to test this idea was to break the sample into categories of area of origin such as farm, village, city, etc., and then compute weighted scores according to the importance placed on each reason by the migrants in the specific category. Dividing the total weighted score by the number of migrants in each category will give a score with a range of 0 to 3.00. The higher the score, the more importance placed on that reason for moving by the migrants.

Table 26a presents the weighted scores for the seven residence categories on each of 12 reasons for moving. The general reasons of "to live in the country" and "to get out of the city" ranked as either the first or second most important reasons for all groups, except those moving from the farm. They, logically, did not rate getting out of the city as high as other factors. In general, the larger city and metropolitan movers rated these general reasons higher than other residence groups. Freedom from pollution, and a place to raise children generally ranked as the third or fourth most important reasons for all groups, with few exceptions. Migrants from farms ranked "a place to raise children" as their most important reason. Crime rates were ranked about in the middle, except for large city and metropolitan migrants, who ranked crime as the third and fourth most important reason, respectively.

Job opportunities and job transfer were not rated as important, except by farm and village movers.

III. Origin of the Migrants

One of the major goals of the study was to determine where the migrants had moved from. Several different questions were asked in this section of the questionnaire. The major information comes from a residence history. Respondents were asked to list previous residences by state, city and county and dates of residence. In addition, information was obtained on the type of area the migrants had moved from and where they had spent their youth.

Early Years of Migrants:

Respondents were asked to identify the type of area where they had spent their first 15 years. From Table 29, it is evident that there is a wide variety of residences among migrants in their early years. The dominant category is farm residence, represented by slightly more than a quarter of the migrants. Open country, village and small city rearing were represented by 15 to 16 percent each. Ten percent of the migrants had been raised in metropolitan areas.

Area of Origin:

From the migration history obtained from migrants, it is possible to depict the area of origin in several ways. It is possible to determine state and county of origin, as well as metropolitan-nonmetropolitan origin.

About 58 percent of the migrants came from within the state of Ohio. Of the out-of-staters, more migrants originated in West Virginia than in any other state (11.8 percent). The remainder of the migrants came from widely diverse areas, including almost five percent from abroad. These are mostly individuals returning home from military service.

Table 31 shows the major counties of origin in the migrants. Counties adjacent to the study area (Hocking, Perry, Morgan, Washington, Lawrence, Scioto, Pike and Ross Counties) accounted for about 20 percent of the in-state migrants. Franklin County accounted for over one-third of Ohio migrants, with other individual counties making up substantially less of the areas of origin.

In Table 32, the origin counties have been coded according to metropolitan status. Besides the 43 percent who moved from out of state, well over half of the Ohio migrants came from the core counties of metropolitan areas. An additional one-fifth of the in-state migrants originated in metropolitan ring counties, with about 23 percent coming from nonmetropolitan counties.

Of interest here is the question of whether the migrants are return migrants who have lived previously in the area or if they are new to the area. Table 33 shows that almost two-thirds of the migrants were not born in the study area, nor had they lived there previously. About 1 out of 8 respondents had been born in the region, but moved away. An additional 16 percent had lived previously in the region, and 9 percent had been born in the area, moved away, and then had moved back at least once prior to the current move.

Date of Move:

Migrants could have moved into the GROW area anytime between 1970 and the time of the survey. From Table 34, it is evident that the migration has been spread over the period. 1974 and 1975 are the dominant years, with 22 percent and 19 percent, respectively.

IV. Miscellaneous Dimensions of Migration

Several other dimensions of the rural turnaround can be examined through the current study.

Area of Residence:

Of interest is the type of area which the migrants are moving into in the region. The dominant type for the migrants to the GROW area is the open country with 43 percent of the residences. This is followed by village and farm residences at 26 percent and 20 percent respectively (Table 35). Although residents of the three largest cities in the region were excluded from the study, still very few of the migrants are moving into the other cities or towns.

Housing:

What kinds of housing do the migrants obtain in the GROW area? From Table 36, 58 percent have bought or are buying a home. Ownership of a mobile home is second at 19 percent, with an additional 2 percent renting mobile homes. Thirteen percent are renting houses.

Respondents were asked whether they had trouble finding a place to live when they moved into the region. Less than one-fourth indicated encountering any problems (Table 37).

Those residents who had problems were asked what kinds of housing trouble they encountered. Equal numbers reported a lack of available housing to buy or to rent at 37 percent each (Table 38).

Location of Employment:

Do the migrants work in the region or outside it? From Table 39, it is evident that almost three-fourths of those employed work in one of the five study counties. Athens County is the work home of more of the migrants

than any of the other counties. Nearly 10 percent work out of state, with most of those going to West Virginia.

Table 40 reports on distance to work. Over 38 percent work less than 10 miles from their residence, with an additional 31 percent working 10 to 19 miles away. Approximately 18 percent go more than 30 miles to their employment.

V. Implications

Most of the implications of the rural turnaround will need to be implied from the characteristics of the migrants and their reasons for moving, or from the survey of community leaders. However, two pieces of evidence obtained from the migrants are directly relevant here. A question was asked on plans to stay in the area and migrants were asked to compare their current and previous residences on 12 community factors.

Plans to Stay:

More than 4 out of 5 migrants plan to stay in southern Ohio five years or more. Only six percent plan to move within two years (Table 41).

Comparison of Community Factors:

Migrants were asked to rate 12 community factors as better, the same, or worse than in their previous residence. Table 42 shows only two areas where their current residence is substantially better. These are: as a place to raise children and pollution, both seen as better by about two-thirds of the migrants. Almost equal numbers placed recreational facilities in the three categories of better, the same, and worse. The cost of living was seen as better by a small margin over those who saw it as worse (31 percent to 24 percent).

On the other side, almost two-thirds of the migrants thought that both job opportunities and shopping facilities were worse than in their former communities. Over one-half said medical services were worse. Housing, education and solid waste pick-up were seen as worse by about 40 percent of the migrants.

Comparison of Community Factors by Area Moved From:

Does the comparison of current and previous communities differ for migrants moving from larger cities than for other migrants? Insight on this can be gained from a cross classification of migrants by area of origin and their assessment of community factors.

Table 43 shows percentages of respondents in each residence category who see their current residence as better than their previous one on each factor. Only two factors show a majority of migrants as better satisfied than previously. Migrants from all residence categories view their current residence as a better place to raise children. Large city and metropolitan movers were particularly prone to see this factor as better.

All categories except movers from farms had a majority of respondents viewing the pollution situation as better in their current residence.

Cost of living tended to be viewed as better by the larger urban migrants than those from rural areas. Farm and village migrants tended to rate medical facilities better than urban movers.

The obverse of the above data is presented in Table 44, where percentages of migrants rating community factors as worse are cross-classified by area of origin.

Job opportunities, shopping facilities, and medical facilities were generally rated as worse by most groups. Only in the farm and village mover categories did less than half of the respondents rate job opportunities as

worse. Almost three-fourths of the migrants from large cities, metropolitan areas and the open country viewed this factor as worse than in their previous communities. Similar findings were obtained on the shopping facilities factor. A majority of movers from towns and larger areas also rated medical services as worse.

Summary and Conclusion

The overall goal of this research project has been to develop an understanding of the rural turnaround through a descriptive study of recent migrants to a five county area of southern Ohio. An effort was made to determine who was migrating in socio-eocnomic and demographic terms, why they had moved, and where they had moved from. Following is a summary of the major findings of the research:

1. Migrants represent a full range of ages, but are heaviest in the 25-34 age group and represent a younger age structure than the natives.
2. About 2 out of 5 migrants were born outside Ohio, with half of those being born in West Virginia. Of those born in Ohio, about half were born in the study area counties or adjacent counties.
3. Two-thirds of the new residents are employed full-time. Thirteen percent are retired. A full range of occupations is represented, with a quarter employed in skilled blue collar jobs. Seventeen percent hold professional positions.
4. Less than ten percent of the movers farm full time, but 17 percent own a farm.
5. The average educational level of migrants is higher than the native population. Three of four migrants are high school graduates, and one in five has a college degree.
6. The new residents represent a wide spread in family incomes with a median of slightly over $12,000. Equal proportions earn under $5,00 and over $20,000 (17%).

7. The most prevalent reasons given for moving centered around the attractiveness of the country or the detractions of the city. Other prominent responses include returning home and job related reasons.
8. One of every four migrants had been reared on a farm, with one in ten raised in a metropolitan area.
9. About two of five migrants moved into the study area from outside Ohio, with West Virginia being the most prominent state of origin. Of the in-state migrants, 20 percent moved from counties adjacent to the study area, and over three-fourths came from metropolitan areas. One in three in-state migrants moved from Franklin County.
10. Forty-three percent of the new residents moved into the open country areas of the study counties. Other prominent locations were villages and farm residences.
11. Nearly three of five movers own or are buying a home. About 20 percent own mobile homes. One quarter of the migrants reported having trouble finding a place to live when they moved.
12. Three-fourths of the respondents are employed in the study area, with about 70 percent driving less than 20 miles to work.
13. A comparison of current and previous residences on several community factors showed migrants to rate their new communities as worse on more factors than they rated as better. The study area was rated as better relative to pollution and as a place to raise children. Job opportunities, shopping facilities and medical services were rated as worse by a majority of the movers. Still, over 80 percent of the migrants plan to stay in the study area five years or more.

Conclusion

It is clear that the recent migrants to the five study counties do not represent any single identifiable socio-economic group. A full range of ages, education, incomes and occupations are represented among the new residents. On average, however, the newcomers represent a higher socio-economic level than the native population.

Likewise, motivation for moving varies widely, but exhibits some identifiable tendencies. It might be suggested that the phrase "urban dropouts" could be applied to a large segment of the migrants. These could represent that proportion of the urban population, found in residential preference surveys, that prefer to live in rural areas or small towns. This could be true even when taking into account the reduction in those preferring rural areas when distance and other factors are taken into account. A number of factors could be proposed to explain why these people are now actuating those preferences. If one accepts the proposition that the decision to move involves a weighing and balancing of both positive and negative factors at the areas of origin and destination, then one might suggest that a shift in the values or weights that migrants place on various factors would lead to a decision to change residence.

For example, the negative factors at the area of origin such as crime, pollution, congestion, etc. might now be seen as more undesirable than in earlier years. And/or the positive factors at the area of destination such as open space, clean air, and lower crime rates might now be valued more highly than previously. Migrants might also be willing to trade-off certain disadvantages of the new area against the disadvantages. For example, lower paying jobs or fewer or less desirable community services might be balanced off against the advantages of living in the country. This is suggested in the current research

by the finding that migrants rate their new communities as worse on several community or service factors than their old residences, yet still plan to stay in the area.

If you couple the above situation with the fact that a substantial proportion of the migrants were able to find employment in the study area, than it would suggest that employment was a facilitating factor in the move. Without employment, the move might not have been made, yet migrants did not cite it as the major reason for the move.

Rounding out the situation is the fact that a significant portion of the migrants see the move as returning home or bringing them nearer to relatives. Retireees might also be added to these categories.

For the local communities, the new growth will probably represent a mixed blessing. The migration reverses a previous trend of out-migration, particularly of young adults. The new residents represent potential new lifeblood and leadership for local institutions. They likewise represent potential for an improved economy as the tax base grows and demand for local businesses increases.

On the other hand, there is also the potential for conflict between the natives and newcomers.

Sorenson (1976) suggests that the newcomers may want to limit new growth, while the leadership of the community, particularly as represented by the Chamber of Commerce, will want to foster development. This has been expressed as the notion that each migrant wants to be the last new resident to an area.

However, there is another possibility. It could be the migrants who press for changes. For example, the migrants might decide that they want services equivalent to what existed in the urban areas that they left. This could be in the form of increased school facilities, water and sewer projects, garbage collection, improved medical facilities, etc. The resultant tax increases to provide

for these services might well be viewed negatively by the original populace.

In either case, the new residents would be pitted against one or another segments of the community where development is concerned. Such possibilities will need to be recognized by the turnaround communities if the effects of growth are to minimize.

Table 4

Sex

Sex	Number	Percent
Male	190	85.6
Female	32	14.4
Total	222	100.0

Table 5

Marital Status

Marital Status	Number	Percent
Never Married	18	8.1
Married	191	86.0
Separated	2	0.9
Divorced	7	3.2
Widowed	4	1.8
Total	222	100.0

Table 6

Age

Age	Number	Percent
Under 25	22	9.9
25-34	97	43.7
35-44	36	16.2
45-54	30	13.5
55-64	24	10.8
65+	13	5.9
Total	22	100.0
Median		33.5

Table 7

State of Birth

Area	All Areas		Out of State
	Number	Percent	Percent
Ohio	137	61.7	---
West Virginia	40	18.0	47.1
Kentucky	9	4.1	10.6
Other Adjacent States	11	5.0	12.9
Northeast	3	1.4	3.5
North Central	10	4.5	11.8
South	8	3.6	9.4
West	3	1.4	3.5
Abroad	1	0.5	1.2
Total	222	100.0	100.0

Table 8

County of Birth

Area	All Areas Number	All Areas Percent	Within State Percent
GROW Area Counties	49	22.3	36.3
Counties Adjacent to GROW area	20	9.1	14.8
Franklin County	21	9.5	15.6
Cuyahoga County	7	3.2	5.2
Other Ohio Co.	38	17.3	28.1
Out of State	85	38.6	----
Total	220	100.0	100.0

Table 9

County of Birth by
Metropolitan Status

Area	Number	Percent
GROW	49	36.3
Metropolitan Core	51	37.8
Metropolitan Ring	11	8.1
Nonmetropolitan	24	17.8
Total	135	100.0

Table 10

Employment Status

Employment	Number	Percent
Full time	148	67.0
Part-time	12	5.4
Homemaker	8	3.6
Student	4	1.8
Retired	29	13.1
Disabled	9	4.1
Unemployed, LFW	10	4.5
Unemployed, NLFW	1	0.5
Total	221	100.0

LFW = Looking for work
NLFW = Not looking for work

Table 11

Second Job Employment

Second Job Status	Number	Percent
Hold a Second Job	34	15.3
Does not hold a Second Job	188	84.7
Total	222	100.0

Table 12

Employment of Spouse

Employment	Number	Percent
Full-time	54	28.4
Part-time	21	11.1
Homemaker	81	42.6
Student	8	4.2
Retired	11	5.8
Disabled	1	0.5
Unemployed, LFW	2	1.1
Unemployed, NLFW	12	6.3
Total	190	100.0

LFW = Looking for work
NLFW = Not looking for work

Table 13

Occupational Category

Occupation	Number	Percent
Professional	36	16.7
Managers, Administrators & Owners	13	6.0
White Collar	37	17.2
Skilled Blue Collar	59	27.4
SemiSkilled & Unskilled	42	19.5
Farm Owners	3	1.4
Service Workers	6	2.8
Disabled	3	1.4
Unclassified	16	7.4
Total	215	100.0

Table 14

Selected Detailed Occupations

Occupation Category	Number	Percent
Professional		
Education	16	7.2
Engineers and Scientists	9	4.1
White Collar		
Civil Service	13	5.9
Managers & Buyers	14	6.3
Blue Collar - Skill		
Construction and Maintenance	28	12.6
Operators	20	9.0
Semi & Unskilled		
General Labor	14	6.3
Construction & Maintenance Labor	16	7.2
Coal Miner	15	6.8

Table 15

Farm Ownership

	Number	Percent
Own a Farm	37	16.7
Does not own a Farm	185	83.3
Total	222	100.0

Table 16

Farm Size

Acres	Number	Percent
Under 50	9	24.3
50-99	13	35.1
100-149	10	27.0
150+	5	13.5
Total	37	100.0

Range = 13 to 222 acres

Table 17

Work on Farms

	Number	Percent
Farm Full-time	4	9.8
Farm Part-time	27	65.9
Work for Wages	10	24.4
Total	41	100.0

Table 18

Number of Children at Home

Children	Number	Percent
None	94	42.5
1	38	17.2
2	46	20.8
3	29	13.1
4	11	5.0
5	3	1.4
Total	221	100.0

Table 19

Ages of Children at Home

Age	Number	Percent
0-4	60	21.0
5-9	100	35.0
10-14	63	22.0
15-18	41	14.3
19+	22	7.7
Total	286	100.0

Table 20

Education of Respondents

Years	Number	Percent
8 and Under	21	9.5
9-11	26	11.8
12	85	38.6
13-15	42	19.1
16+	46	20.9
Total	220	100.0

Median = 12 years

Table 21

Education of Spouses

Years	Number	Percent
8 and Under	16	8.3
9-11	35	18.1
12	93	48.2
13-15	25	13.0
16+	24	12.4
Total	193	100.0

Median = 12 years

Table 22

Family Income

Income	Number	Percent
Under $3,000	20	9.3
3-4,999	16	7.4
5-6,999	13	6.0
7-9,999	35	16.3
10-14,999	58	27.0
15-19,999	36	16.7
20-24,999	18	8.4
25,000+	19	8.8
Total	215	100.0

Median = 12,069

Table 23

Open-ended Response to
Reasons for Moving

Reason	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Job Opportunity	52	16.3
Live in the Country	50	15.6
To be near Relatives	35	10.9
To get out of the City	26	8.1
Come Back Home	25	7.8
Job Transfer	21	6.6
Retirement	20	6.3
Go to College	15	4.7
Cost of Living	12	3.8
Lack of Pollution	12	3.8
To Raise Children	11	3.4
Marriage	7	2.2
Return from Service	7	2.2
To Farm	7	2.2
Other	20	6.3
Total	320	100.0

Table 24

Reasons for Moving:
Combined Categories

Reasons	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Reasons Related to the Area [1]	119	37.2
a. General [2]	76	23.8
b. Specific [3]	43	13.4
Come Back Home [4]	74	23.1
Job Related [5]	73	22.8
Retirement	20	6.3
Other	34	10.6
Total	320	100.0

[1] Includes the categories of "to live in the country" and "to get out of the city".
[2] Includes specifics such as cost of living, environment, etc.
[3] Includes marriage, to be near relatives, etc.
[4] Includes both job opportunities and job transfers

Table 25

Response to the Importance of Selected Reasons in the Decision to Move

Reason	Number of Responses: Very Important	Important	Not Very Important	Not Important at All	Total
Lower Cost of Living	35	47	43	97	222
Recreational Facilities	20	50	54	98	222
Retirement	26	37	34	125	222
Job Transfer	60	12	13	137	222
Decreased Crime & Vandalism	51	53	35	83	222
To Live in Country	108	51	12	51	222
To take over the Family Farm	7	8	8	199	222
Better Educational Facilities	32	39	38	113	222
Better Job Opportunities	37	36	30	119	222
Freedom from Pollution	70	58	23	71	222
To get out of the City	108	39	17	58	222
To Raise Children	80	36	12	94	222

Table 26

Weighted Responses to Selected Factors in the Decision to Move

Reason	Weighted Score
Lower Cost of Living	242
Recreational Facilities	214
Retirement	186
Job Transfer	217
Decreased Crime & Vandalism	294
To Live in the Country	438
To take over the Family Farm	45
Better Educational Facilities	212
Better Job Opportunities	213
Freedom from Pollution	349
To get out of the City	419
To Raise Children	324

Table 27

Job Change With Move

Job Status	Number	Percent
Changed Jobs	134	62.0
Did not Change Jobs	82	38.0
Total	216	100.0

Table 26a

Reasons for Moving by Area Moved From,
Weighted by Importance of the Reason*

	Area Moved From							
Reasons	Farm	Open Country	Village	Town	City	Large City	Metro-politan	Total
Lower Cost of Living	1.13	1.00	.70	1.00	1.19	.95	1.25	1.09
Recreational Facilities	1.00	1.00	.74	1.00	.89	.95	1.08	.96
Retirement	.88	.69	.74	.76	.83	1.00	.90	.84
Job Transfer	1.50	.92	1.35	.86	.98	1.16	.71	.98
Decreased Crime	1.25	.96	.78	1.33	1.17	1.58	1.75	1.32
Live in the Country	1.63	2.04	1.52	1.81	1.70	2.00	2.48	1.97
Take over Family Farm	.19	.27	.13	.24	.07	.37	.25	.20
Better Educational Facilities	1.13	.58	.87	1.43	.89	1.16	.94	.95
Better Job Opportunities	1.44	.77	1.22	1.10	1.00	1.11	.70	.96
Freedom from Pollution	1.44	1.15	1.17	1.71	1.44	1.53	2.00	1.57
Get out of the City	1.13	1.38	1.43	2.00	1.78	2.05	2.46	1.89
Raise Children	1.69	1.23	1.35	1.81	1.28	1.53	1.56	1.46

*Weighted scores may range from 0 to 3.00. A score of 0 would indicate that all respondents had rated a particular reason as "not important at all" for their move. A score of 3.00 would indicate that all respondents had rated that reason as "very important" for their move.

Table 28

Time of Job Change

Job Change	Number	Percent
After Move	78	40.8
Before Move	57	29.8
Already Had a Job	56	29.3
Total	191	100.0

Table 29

Type of Area Where Migrants Were Reared

Area	Number	Percent
Farm	59	26.7
Open Country	36	16.3
Village (under 2,500)	34	15.4
Town (2,500-10,000)	16	7.2
City (10,000-50,000)	36	16.3
Large City (50,000-250,000)	17	7.7
Metropolitan (over 250,000)	23	10.4
Total	221	100.0

Table 30

Move into GROW Area by State of Origin

Counties	Total	Percent	Out of State Percent
Ohio	127	57.7	---
West Virginia	26	11.8	28.0
Kentucky	6	2.7	6.5
Other Adjacent States	13	5.9	14.0
Northeast	6	2.7	6.5
North Central	9	4.1	9.7
South	16	7.3	17.2
West	7	3.2	7.5
Abroad	10	4.5	10.8
Total	220	100.0	100.0

Table 31

Move into GROW Area by County of Origin

County	Total	Percent	In State Percent
Adjacent Counties	24	11.1	19.5
Franklin	43	19.8	35.0
Greene	5	2.3	4.1
Montgomery	8	3.7	6.5
Muskingum	5	2.3	4.1
Cuyahoga	4	1.8	3.3
Other Ohio Counties	34	15.7	27.6
Out of State	94	43.3	----
Total	217	100.0	100.0

Table 32

Move into GROW Area by Metropolitan Status

Area	Total	Percent	In State Percent
Metropolitan Core	70	32.3	56.9
Metropolitan Ring	25	11.5	20.3
NonMetropolitan	28	12.9	22.8
Out of State	94	43.3	----
Total	217	100.0	100.0

Table 33

Prior Experience in the Study Area

Prior Experience	Number	Percent
Birth Only	28	12.6
Prior Residence Only	35	15.8
Birth and Prior Residence	19	8.6
No Previous Experience	140	63.1
Total	222	100.1

Table 34

Date of Move into GROW Area

Year	Total	Percent
1970	26	12.0
1971	21	9.7
1972	19	8.8
1973	30	13.8
1974	41	18.9
1975	48	22.1
1976	32	14.8
Total	217	100.0

Table 35

Area of Residence

Area	Number	Percent
Farm	44	19.9
Open Country	96	43.4
Village	57	25.8
Town	15	6.8
City	9	4.1
Total	221	100.0

Table 36

Type of Housing

Housing	Number	Percent
Own or Buying Home	129	58.1
Rent Home	29	13.1
Rent Apartment	6	2.7
Own Mobile Home	42	18.9
Rent Mobile Home	5	2.3
Live with Relatives	5	2.3
Other	6	2.7
Total	222	100.0

Table 37

Extent of Housing Trouble
Upon Moving to Southern Ohio

Type	Number	Percent
Had Housing Problems	50	22.5
No Housing Problems	172	77.5
Total	222	100.0

Table 38

Kinds of Housing Trouble

Problems	Number	Percent
High Prices	3	6.1
Nothing to Buy	18	36.7
Nothing to Rent	18	36.7
Other	10	20.4
Total	49	100.0

Table 39

Location of Major Employment

County	Number	Percent
GROW Area	125	74.4
Athens	46	27.4
Gallia	23	13.7
Jackson	18	10.7
Meigs	33	19.6
Vinton	5	3.0
Hocking	7	4.2
Franklin	6	3.6
Other Ohio Counties	14	8.3
West Virginia	13	7.7
Other States	3	1.8
Total	168	100.0

Table 40

Distance to Major Employment

Miles	Number	Percent
Under 10	61	38.4
10-19	50	31.4
20-29	19	11.9
30-39	14	8.8
40-49	4	2.5
50-74	6	3.8
75+	5	3.1
Total	159	100.0

Table 41

Plans to Stay in the Area

Years	Number	Percent
Plan to Stay Under 2 years	13	5.9
Plan to Stay 2 to 5 years	27	12.3
Plan to Stay 5 or more Years	179	81.7
Total	219	100.0

Table 42

Comparison of Current and Previous Residences on Selected Community Factors

	Number				Percent			
Factor	Better	Same	Worse	Total	Better	Same	Worse	Total
Adequate Housing	29	88	95	212	13.7	41.5	44.8	100.0
Job Opportunities	25	47	138	210	11.9	22.4	65.7	100.0
Recreational Facilities	74	65	71	210	35.2	30.9	33.8	100.0
Pollution	136	44	31	211	64.5	20.9	14.7	100.0
Cost of Living	67	95	51	213	31.5	44.6	23.9	100.0
Education-Schools	46	78	82	206	22.3	37.9	39.8	100.0
Solid Waste Pickup	29	98	83	210	13.8	46.7	39.5	100.0
Place to Raise Children	139	46	25	210	66.2	21.9	11.9	100.0
Medical Services	31	67	115	213	14.6	31.5	54.0	100.0
Religious Facilities	35	150	25	210	16.7	71.4	11.9	100.0
Welfare Services	30	122	33	185	16.2	65.9	17.8	100.0
Shopping Facilities	25	50	138	213	11.7	23.5	64.8	100.0

Table 43

Comparison of Community Factors by Area Moved From:
Percent Rating Factors as Better than in Previous Community

	Area Moved From							
Factor	Farm	Open Country	Village	Town	City	Large City	Metro-politan	Total
Housing	-0-	13.0	9.5	14.3	13.5	21.1	16.4	13.7
Job Opportunities	20.0	13.0	19.0	15.0	9.8	15.8	6.6	11.9
Recreational Facilities	33.3	39.1	35.0	23.8	34.6	33.3	39.3	35.2
Pollution	33.3	56.5	68.4	61.9	59.6	68.4	77.4	64.5
Cost of Living	20.0	22.7	28.6	19.0	37.7	36.8	35.5	31.5
Education - schools	13.3	21.7	30.0	30.0	15.7	22.2	25.4	22.3
Solid Waste Pick-up	20.0	26.1	35.0	4.8	7.7	-0-	13.1	13.8
Place to Raise Children	66.7	52.2	60.0	61.9	58.8	77.8	77.4	66.2
Medical Facilities	33.3	13.0	38.1	9.5	5.7	10.5	13.1	14.6
Religious Facilities	13.3	8.7	19.0	9.5	9.8	15.8	28.3	16.7
Welfare Services	33.3	9.1	27.8	-0-	16.7	5.6	20.0	16.2
Shopping Facilities	20.0	13.0	23.8	4.8	9.6	10.5	9.7	11.7

Table 44

Comparison of Community Factors by Area Moved From:
Percent Rating Factors as Worse than in Previous Community

	Area Moved From							
Factor	Farm	Open Country	Village	Town	City	Large City	Metro-politan	Total
Housing	33.3	43.5	38.1	42.9	53.8	36.8	45.9	44.8
Job Opportunities	40.0	73.9	42.9	50.0	68.6	73.7	77.0	65.7
Recreational Facilities	20.0	26.1	25.0	28.6	44.2	55.6	29.5	33.8
Pollution	26.7	26.1	10.5	19.0	9.6	21.1	9.7	14.7
Cost of Living	26.7	18.2	28.6	33.3	20.8	26.3	22.6	23.9
Education - schools	26.7	47.8	25.0	35.0	49.0	44.4	37.3	39.8
Solid Waste Pick-up	26.7	34.8	20.0	33.3	38.5	33.3	55.7	39.5
Place to Raise Children	13.3	8.7	15.0	14.3	13.7	16.7	8.1	11.9
Medical Services	26.7	43.5	28.6	57.1	62.3	57.9	63.9	54.0
Religious Facilities	6.7	13.0	14.3	4.8	11.8	21.1	11.7	11.9
Welfare Services	8.3	22.7	27.8	17.6	16.7	11.1	18.0	17.8
Shopping Facilities	40.0	56.5	47.6	71.4	75.0	57.9	71.0	64.8

REFERENCES CITED

Beale, Calvin L., 1975, The Revival of Population Growth in Nonmetropolitan America, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service-605, June.

Beale, Calvin L., 1976, "A Further Look at Nonmetropolitan Population Growth Since 1970," American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 58, No. 5, December, pp. 953-958.

Beale, Calvin L., 1977, "Current Status of the Shift of U.S. Population to Smaller Communities," Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, St. Louis, Missouri.

Carpenter, Edwin H., 1977, "The Potential for Population Dispersal: A Closer Look at Residential Locational Preferences," Rural Sociology, Vol. 42, No. 3 (Fall) pp. 352-370.

Fuguitt, Glenn V., and James J. Zuiches, 1975, "Residential Preferences and Population Distribution," Demography, Vol. 12 (August), pp. 491-504.

Sorensen, Donald M., 1976, Reverse Migration and the Rural Community Development Problem, WRDC Discussion Paper No. 9, Corvallis, Oregon, Western Rural Development Center.

Thomas, Donald W., 1976, "Ohio's Population at Mid-Decade," Socio-Economic Information, No. 582, Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Thomas, Donald W., 1977, The Rural Turnaround in Ohio: 1970 to 1975, Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Ohio State University, ESS No. 560, November.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1972, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Series PC(1)-C37, Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973, General Population Characteristics, Series PC(1)-B37, Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1976, Estimates of the Population of Ohio Counties, Series P-26, No. 75-35, September.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1977, Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 683, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1965, Net Migration of the Population, 1950-60, Economic Research Service, Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1975, Net Migration of the Population, 1960-70, Economic Research Service, Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wardwell, John M., 1977, "Equilibrium and Change in Nonmetropolitan Growth," Rural Sociology, Vol. 42, No. 2 (Summer), pp. 156-179.